



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same beneficent end, that we find the best and the strongest hope of what in my heart I believe to be the greatest of all reforms — the establishment of peace upon earth. [Cheers.]

A Strange Contrast.

BY DAVID LLOYD-GEORGE, BRITISH CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

[The following is the substance of the admirable speech of Mr. Lloyd-George at the great public meeting of the Peace Congress in Queen's Hall, London, July 28.]

It really seems incredible when you begin to reflect upon it that it should be necessary in the twentieth century of the Christian era to hold a meeting in a civilized country to protest against an expenditure by Christian communities of £400,000,000 a year upon preparing one nation to kill another. [Shame.] It is still more amazing that the leaders of opinion should be more engrossed on the perfecting and rendering more deadly of the machinery of human slaughter than upon setting up some tribunal for the peaceful adjustment of disputes.

If one statesman has a dispute with another he settles it by arbitration or conference, but the moment he undertakes to settle for other people he at once resorts to the machinery of assassination. But why? Do the nations hate each other? In Germany there are a number of people who produce beet. They sell masses of it to us. Why should they kill their best customers? That is the worst way of getting on in business. We buy £10,000,000 of goods from Germany. Why should they kill us? They buy about £30,000,000 of goods from us. Well, really, when a man comes to your shop like this you don't knock him down with a cannon ball. That is not the way to increase your trade. It is time to exercise a little more common sense.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF MOTIVES.

And yet, while we are buying and selling peaceably, Germans to us and we to Germans, profiting by each other's trade, we are building ships and arming to fight. Why do nine-tenths of these disputes come? Nine-tenths of these disputes arise from misunderstanding of each other's motives. There are people in this country in a very exalted position and of great experience firmly under the impression that Germany means to attack us. There are people in Germany equally convinced that we are preparing to attack them. From fear of each other we are arming and rushing into the very quarrel we are afraid of. We have exactly the same state of things with France. I was very interested to read one of the speeches of Richard Cobden delivered in 1853 at a peace meeting in Manchester. I advise you to read that speech. There is not an argument they advance about Germany now that they did not advance about France then.

AN UNDERSTANDING WITH GERMANY.

There has not been a new scare invented for sixty years. The only thing that is real is the expenditure. We say, in order to secure ourselves against invasion, we must have a two-power standard navy. Look at the position of Germany. Her army is to her what our navy is to us — the sole defense against invasion. She has not a two-power standard. She may have a larger army than either of her neighbors, but any combination of them

could pour in a larger number of troops. Would not we be frightened? Would not we arm? Of course we would. Germany is frightened for a reason that would have frightened us. What is wanted is a clearing up of misconceptions. It is deplorable that two great progressive communities like Germany and Britain should not be able to establish a good understanding. We have done it with France, with Russia and the United States of America. Why could not we rope Germany in?

THE REAL FOES TO FIGHT.

We spend in this country every year £60,000,000 of money on preparing for war. What a stupendous waste is that! What might have been done you can each imagine for yourself in trade, commerce, in improvement in the conditions of the people, in their enlightenment, in their development, in the general alleviation of suffering, and in raising the people above the level of despair. But are not there plenty worse enemies to fight than Germany — intemperance [Cheers], ignorance, vice, and that most dread of all invaders that sooner or later reaches every home? Are the dominions of death not wide enough that nations should spend £400,000,000 on extending them? There were Crusades in the Middle Ages, where princes and nations dropped their feuds and abandoned their quarrels for some great purpose. There are nobler purposes awaiting princes and peoples to-day. Let them cast aside suspicion, quarrels and feuds, and unite in redeeming humanity from the quagmire into which millions have sunk in misery and despair. [Loud applause.]

Justice and Peace—A Vision for Europe.

Address of Lord Courtney of Penwith, President, at the formal opening of the London Peace Congress in Caxton Hall, Tuesday morning, July 28.

We have a very rigid time-table, to which I propose to adhere strictly. I propose, therefore, to go at once to the single thought which I desire to submit to you in connection with this Congress, and that is the connection between justice and peace. Without justice we can have no guarantee of permanent peace. With justice the peace of the world is unassailable. There are words in an old poem — familiar to many generations of Englishmen, and in some sort familiar no doubt to our foreign friends — which often occur to my mind in relation to this thought. The words as we use them run thus:

“Mercy and Truth have met together;
Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.”

Righteousness and peace, or, as we say now, justice and peace. Without righteousness, no peace; with righteousness, perpetual peace. When injustice is once enthroned and in possession, there must be a perpetual desire to overthrow the injustice and establish right in its place; and when injustice possesses the minds of nations and rulers there is a perpetual instinct to be unjust and to establish that order of things against which we have to rebel.

I know there are some among us who believe that the only sure way to get rid of injustice is not to rise against it, but to observe the passive resistance of those who do not acknowledge and will not strike against the system. That is a noble creed. I would envy those who could

possess it in the full, and I never would say one word to lessen the faith of those who hold it. It is a creed sanctioned by the highest, the deepest authorities to which we can appeal; and if I do not put it before you to-day as a solution of the great evil with which we are fighting, I still will utter no word which will suggest any disparagement of it.

But now, in respect of injustice — looking back upon the wars of the past, most of them we now know to be admitted by all men to have been preventable. Yet there are some of which our friends still say, and say with much plausibility, that they were inevitable. They were wars to get rid of injustice, wars to upset cruel, hard dominations, wars to establish the liberties of races and communities. If there had been no injustice these, the most defensible of all wars, would have been unnecessary. And though we may appeal to them and think of them with feelings of admiration and respect for those who suffered loss of life, extinction of all happiness, forfeiture of all they longed for in bringing about the justice, the independence, and the liberty for which they struggled and protested, yet if we can get rid of injustice to-day, if we can secure the rule of justice throughout the world, this admiration itself, which is so attractive, which carries away, and I cannot say wrongly carries away, so many young minds, would cease to have its advantage.

HOW TO FIGHT INJUSTICE.

How shall we labor to bring about that great result? How shall we get rulers and nations to cease to aspire to obtain power over others? How shall we get the members and nations to be just to one another, so that they shall not even tolerate the thought of wrongdoing? How shall we get amongst nations what we have succeeded in obtaining within nations — reference to law instead of to force, an appeal to the privileges and the powers of society for enforcing justice, instead of an appeal, a resort to what power we can command to compel justice? How can we hope to bring about this result?

The first thing to which I would direct your attention is to use all your powers and opportunities to develop the strength, the scope, the purity of international law. [Applause.] Endeavor as much as you can as individuals to influence your rulers, as much as you can as citizens of free communities to develop, strengthen and purify international law — international law which rises above the separate nations, just as the municipal law of the community rises above the separate citizens. A time there was when there was no such thing as international law. That time has passed away in respect of some of the communities of the world. When Attila's hordes overran Europe there was no thought of international law to bar their steps. They did what they liked. They took what they could get. They killed those in their way. They were the incarnation of brute-force and brute-thirst. That has practically passed away, and we find all nations respecting in some form or other those conventions to which we have given the name of international law. These things arose first of all in the closet. Philosophers, men of piety, and individual thinkers developed the rules which should regulate the conduct of the nations towards one another. These influenced diplomacy in a greater or less degree. Then institutes and associations were founded; and from such

voluntary associations have arisen those conferences which show that rulers of nations desire to carry out and develop the principles and to promote the force and jurisdiction of international law.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCES.

Some of us wished for more work from the Hague Conferences. Some of us thought the one held last year did not accomplish as much as it might. Do not be afraid to indulge in that thought. It is better to seek forward further than we can attain. Unless we do this we shall attain very little. But it would not be just to say that the Hague Conference last year did nothing. It did much. It observed — somewhat to its own discomfort in the management of business — it observed as a cardinal principle that great doctrine which has been slowly evolved amongst nations, of the equality of every nation on earth. [Applause.] Great country, little country, in the conference of nations they are alike. Each civilized community has its own rights which must retain the respect of the others. [Applause.] In the course of time some rules and regulations will be accepted which will remove some of those causes of embarrassment. This is a great thing, a noble thought that you should get all those nations assembled by their delegates to give discussion on equal terms of the development of their rights, security of their possessions and the defence of their just claims.

A TRIBUNAL FOR THE NATIONS.

They consented in principle at the last Hague Conference to a court which should overrule the courts of separate nations, which should be a tribunal of appeal to which the separate nations should have recourse — no longer a court merely open to those who wish to come to it, but a tribunal established which should supersede those, and be a court of appeal to which the private nations should be subjected, and should enforce a law above the conventions of any State, above the authority, above the power of any separate domination.

That was a great effort. Can we do nothing more than this to develop a notion of justice in these nations? Yes, we can. After all, the machinery of justice involves this fundamental right — that when two nations are in disagreement there is a tribunal to which these nations can appeal. In perfect form this tribunal is always in action. Then you have established a law which does away with private violence. If you get that among nations you would have a law which would do away with national violence. We cannot expect to get the establishment of this tribunal all at once to which each party can compel the other to come and to be obedient. But we can begin by getting powers to consent singly that if any differences arise between them those differences shall be referred to a tribunal they name or a tribunal that is existing, — that is to say, we can promote treaties of arbitration, which are in themselves an acknowledgment of deference to right as against the assertion of private will [Applause], an admission that if any difference arises between the two contracting parties that should be referred to an impartial and independent tribunal. We have done much in respect of this line of action in recent years. Nation has combined with nation throughout Europe. They have gone to the United States. We have agreements sometimes for the complete reference, sometimes for partial reference, of the

causes in dispute. We have done much to get this principle admitted, and we see further in this direction to which I want you to give your attention and assistance. In this respect, let me call to your mind the name of a friend of ours who in recent years has perhaps done more than anybody else, at least well deserved to rank with any other, in these treaties of arbitration. My friend Sir Thomas Barclay has gone from city to city, from nation to nation, and succeeded in getting many of these treaties established.

KINSHIP AND UNDERSTANDING.

But underlying all notions of international law, underlying the ideas developed in these private treaties, the great security of peace is to be found in the recognition by the members of different communities of their kinship with members of other communities, in the development of the notion of a common manhood, if not of a common citizenship. There we have the supreme guarantee of perpetual international peace. Try to get together representatives of the States of Europe and America. Try to get the people to understand one another. It is too often said, and with too much truth, you go your way dreaming and talking of your dreams. There lies at the bottom of humanity a great power of passion which when aroused scatters all your fabric of vision, just as a bubble is burst in the air — public passion controlled and burst by public ignorance.

Against these things we have to fight, against these things I implore you to use all your power. [Applause.] Get people to understand one another, to understand how they may be friends, to understand how they may offend one another. This, perhaps, is one of the most difficult lessons to be learned in private or public life. We offend our friends without meaning it, by something in our manner, in the limitations of our thoughts, in the crudity of our expressions. Try to understand other people and other nations, and struggle to correct in you all that savors of arrogance, of pretence, of disregard for the feelings of your neighbors. Shall I for a moment drop from this height and suggest one simple application of this principle? When a foreigner is speaking to you in his own language and you do not understand it, try to be silent and sympathetic. [Hear, hear, and applause.]

Now I cannot pass from this thought without reference to another man who has just passed away, to the great loss of the cause of peace. What a happy thought it was of Sir William Randal Cremer when he brought together the interparliamentary conferences, which made the deputies of Paris conversant with the members of the House of Commons in London, which brought both in contact with the House of Representatives at Washington, and with those of other countries. To Sir William Cremer we owe a great debt. He deserved the award of the Nobel prize, and he showed the elevation of his spirit, the magnanimity of his character, when as a poor man he applied the whole proceeds of his limited resources to the cause of peace. [Applause.]

A VISION FOR EUROPE.

I will give you just a small illustration of what we may hereafter attain — not at once. We have need of patience and faith. Patience without faith would be acquiescence in the evil forever. Faith without patience would produce revolt, disappointment and reaction. But

the thing will come. Turn for a moment to that great federation in the West, where there are things going on that might be questioned, but where we have an illustration of the great principle of arbitration. If the State of New York has a difficulty with the State of Massachusetts, do they go to war? No, the matter is brought to the Supreme Court of the United States to settle their cause of difference. Here is a vision which Europe may some day be able to bring about and apply for its own use. The Courts of Europe shall appeal to a supreme international court, to that court they shall carry their enmities and causes of disagreement and there find a refuge and escape from all those troubles which short-sighted people declare to be inevitable, but which we believe in the future will cease to occur because they will be absorbed in a vision of law, of justice and of peace. [Great applause.]

Peacemakers at London.

Report of the Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress.

BY JAMES L. TRYON.

The seventeenth Universal Peace Congress met in Caxton Hall, London, July 26 to August 1. The fact that it met at the world's greatest centre made it possible to get a large attendance and gave it a peculiarly significant interest. Delegates attended from twenty-four nations, even Turkey, South Africa, India and Japan sending representatives. The sentiments of two hundred and eighty Societies were concentrated there. Members of the Labor and Social Democratic party, the Trades Union Congress, the London Trades Council, the Humanitarian League, the International Law Association, and delegates from reform clubs, women's federations, churches and educational institutions in Great Britain united with the peace workers in a common expression of opinion. From the continent of Europe came a large number of well-known peace advocates. The veteran Passy of France could not come, but Ruyssen, Arnaud and Dumas brought to the meeting that keenness of intellect, that purity of idealism, and that familiarity with the European political situation for which the French delegates are distinguished. From Germany came Pastors Umfrid and Rohleder, Professors Heilberg, Richter and Quidde. Baron de Neufville of Frankfort brought with him a new worker in the person of Baron Von Siebold, the son of the famous scientist of that name whose work for Japan causes him to be remembered by her with gratitude. Baron Von Siebold served as an interpreter and diplomatic agent in making important treaties between Germany and Japan in his earlier life. He brought to the Congress a clear grasp of sound international principles and an admirable spirit of coöperation. Professor Stein of Berne, always a force at a gathering of this kind, represented the Berne Bureau in place of Dr. Gobat, who could not attend.

From Austria came the Baroness Von Suttner and A. H. Fried. Many of the European delegates brought with them their wives and a son or daughter, some of whom had been present at Munich last year and at previous Congresses. Their presence made it possible to have little tea parties at the hotels in the evening, or gave an opportunity for breakfasting in family groups,